

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated June 18, 2003, Applicant submits the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and further examination. By the foregoing amendments claims 1, 8, 20 and 21 have been amended.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

The undersigned thanks Examiner Harper and his supervisor for the courtesy extended during the personal interview conducted on November 17, 2003 which was attended by James Shaffer, Michael Barry and the undersigned. During the interview the foregoing amendments were discussed in general terms as were the Smith and Kanevsky references.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

In the Office Action claim 21 was rejected to based on an informality. By the foregoing amendments that informality has been addressed.

REJECTIONS UNDER SECTION 102

In the Office Action claims 1 and 20 were rejected as being anticipated by Smith et al. (U.S. Patent 5,054,082). In addition, claims 21 and 22 were rejected as being anticipated by Kanevsky et al. (U.S. Patent 5,897,616). In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks Applicant respectfully submit that the pending claims are patentable in view of Smith and Kanevsky.

Smith describes a communication device which can be programmed to respond to voice commands of an individual. A repository of voice recognition code books, with one code book for each individual, is created. When an individual wishes to use the communication device, the code book associated with that individual is transmitted to the device. Thereafter, the communication device responds to the voice commands of that individual by using that individual's code book. See, e.g., Smith, abstract.

Claim 1 is directed to a method of recognizing speech in a communication network based on captured information related to the speaker. In one embodiment of the claimed invention an identifier of a speaker is provided over the communication network. For example, the identifier can be a phone number. A linkage key is then determined using the identifier. Various examples of the linkage key are described, for example, beginning on line 20 of page 10 of the application. In one example, a linkage key is a data value used to associate, in real-time, information located

in multiple databases or network nodes. A subset of records is then selected from a plurality of records based on the linkage key. A vocal expression is then captured from the speaker. Next, a grammar is obtained based upon the subset of records. Information related to the vocal expression is then determined based upon the captured vocal expression which is compared with the grammar.

A specific example or embodiment of the claimed method would begin with capturing the telephone number of a caller. The telephone number is then used to determine the linkage key, for example, the United States Postal Service delivery point code which is a 12 digit code. That DPC code can then be used to determine the address associated with that telephone number. If the goal of the speech recognition system in this example is to confirm the address of the caller, obtaining the street name, apartment number and town using the linkage key allows for a very specific and small grammar. Having such a small grammar based on the subset of records greatly increases the chances of accurate voice recognition.

The Smith reference does not anticipate claims 1 and 20. For example, the Smith reference does not describe or suggest the claimed step of determining a linkage key using the identifier in a method as said forth in claim 1. Smith describes that the user or the communication device in some manner generates a request which identifies a specific code book. The system then transmits that code book to the communication device. However, in the method of claim 1 an identifier related to the speaker is first captured. A linkage key is then determined from that identifier. A subset of records is then selected based upon the linkage key. One advantage provided by the determining of the linkage key is that it allows the method to be used in many different scenarios. On the other hand, the system of Smith has a one to one correspondence between a caller and a code book. In the method of claim 1 the linkage key provides access and allows for the selection of subsets of records from, potentially, numerous databases. Therefore, there is not a one to one correspondence between the identifier related to the speaker and the subset of records upon which the grammar is based.

Claim 20 depends from claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that it is patentable for at least the reasons stated above.

Claims 21 and 22 were rejected as being anticipated by Kanevsky. Kanevsky describes a system for securing access to a service or facility employing automatic speech recognition.

Appl. No. : 10/029,539
Filed : December 20, 2001

Kanevsky, abstract. Kanevsky does not appear to suggest or disclose the method of amended claim 21.

For example, Kanevsky does not describe receiving a linkage key input parameter value which is then used to determine the linkage key. Kanevsky further does not appear to teach or suggest selecting a record from a first subset of records based upon the linkage key. One advantage of the claimed method including receiving a linkage key input parameter value which is then used to determine the linkage key is that the method does not require that the speaker be previously registered with the system. That is unlike the system of Kanevsky which appears to require that speaker be registered with the system prior to employing voice recognitions. See, e.g., Kanevsky, column 13, lines 9-13.

Claim 22 depends from claim 21. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 22 is patentable for at least the reasons stated above.

REJECTION UNDER SECTION 103

Each of the remaining claims is rejected under section 103 in view of various additional references and in view of "well know prior art." Applicant respectfully traverses each of those grounds of rejection. However, in view of the discussion of each of the independent claims above, applicant respectfully submits that each of the claims which depend therefrom are patentable over the references of record for at least the reasons discussed above.

Conclusion

The Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, amendments to the claims, the reasons therefor, and arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claim set are presented above. Any claim amendments which are not specifically discussed in the above remarks are made in order to improve the clarity of claim language, to correct grammatical mistakes or ambiguities, and to otherwise improve the capacity of the claims to particularly and distinctly point out the invention to those of skill in the art. In light of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is specifically requested. If the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to initiate the same with the undersigned.


Appl. No. : 10/029,539
Filed : December 20, 2001

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 12/18/03

By: 
Richard E. Campbell
Registration No. Richard E. Campbell
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

S:\DOCS\REC\REC-8324.DOC\121603